



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/737,217 | 12/15/2003 | Carl Young | G08.150/U | 7693 |
| 28962 | 7590 | 04/25/2008 | | |
| BUCKLEY, MASCHOFF & TALWALKAR LLC | | | | |
| 50 LOCUST AVENUE | | | | |
| NEW CANAAN, CT 06840 | | | | |
| EXAMINER | | | | |
| PLUCINSKI, JAMESUE A | | | | |
| ART UNIT | | PAPER NUMBER | | |
| 3629 | | | | |
| MAIL DATE | | DELIVERY MODE | | |
| 04/25/2008 | | PAPER | | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

**Advisory Action
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

Application No.

10/737,217

Applicant(s)

YOUNG ET AL.

Examiner

JAMISUE A. PLUCINSKI

Art Unit

3629

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 25 March 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☐ The period for reply expires _____ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because:
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7. ☐ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
Claim(s) allowed: _____.
Claim(s) objected to: _____.
Claim(s) rejected: 1,2,4,5,8-10,15 and 16.
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
See Continuation Sheet.
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____.
13. ☐ Other: _____.

/Jamisue A. Plucinski/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3629

Continuation of 11, does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: With respect to Applicant's argument of the 112 1st paragraph: The examiner is rejected the newly added claim limitation, due to the fact that the applicant is adding into the claim that the information that is received, on a real time basis, is not specifically related to the hierarchical levels. In the claims the applicant is attempting to add the limitation, that the security risk associated with the one or more of the first or second elements is also specifically associated with the corresponding hierarchical level of the one or more of the first or second element. The security risk associated with the one or more of the first or second elements, in the claim, is that is which is received in a real time basis. In Paragraph 0040 in the specification it states "Generalized security risk data can be received from a security risk source..." The information on a real time basis, is one from these sources, the specification states that the info from these sources is only generalized information. Therefore the information that is obtained on a real time basis is not specifically related to the hierarchical level in the specification. The applicant has also cited paragraph 0041 of the specification which states how security risk information can be related to the hierarchical levels. The examiner does not contest the fact that security information is related to a specific level. However, AS CLAIMED, the security risk information that is received on a real time basis, is specifically related to the hierarchical level. And it is the examiner's position that this limitation is not taught by the specification. Therefore rejection stands as stated in the Final Office Action.

With respect to Applicant's argument of the prior art rejections: The applicant is arguing the rejection based on the prior art not "setting" the hierarchical levels. As stated in previous rejections, the user of Beverina set up a building with floors and rooms, therefore even though they don't actually use the word "hierarchical", they set a relationship and relate security issues with a building or a floor within a building. Therefore the examiner considers this to be setting a hierarchical relationship and setting a hierarchical level. Arguments are not considered to be persuasive and rejection stands as stated above.